

REMARKS

Claims 7-12 are pending in the application. Applicant cancelled Claims 1-6. Applicant added Claims 7-12. Applicant has not added any new matter to the application.

Claims 7-12 are Neither Anticipated nor Obvious

In the office action, Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salzfass et al., (US 200210042815), in view of Amir et al., (US 2003/0055902 A1). The rejections of Claims 1-6 are moot because Applicant cancelled Claims 1-6. Applicant request examination of Claims 7-12 in view of the following remarks.

Claim 7

Applicant respectfully submits that new Claim 7 is neither anticipated nor obvious in view of Amir and Salzfass or the combination of Amir and Salzfass.

In particular, new Claim 7 describes the limitations of "a processor in communication with the first storage unit, the processor configured to change the status of any one of the plurality of e-mail accounts in response to a change status request from the communication terminal" and "wherein each e-mail account flag indicates a status of the respective e-mail account as active or inactive and a terminal identifier of the communication terminal."

In contrast, Amir, paragraph [0045], describes that the "Remote access serve component 54 stores repackaged email message 48 in remote access account 58 dedicated to remote access to the e-mails received at host 20, ... which further maintains a table with both message identification and status information for all incoming e-mail messages received at remote access server 56." However, the status of an e-mail message is not the same as the status of "a respective e-mail account of the plurality of email accounts," as described in new Claim 7. Contrary to the assertion of the office action, page 4, Amir fails to teach or suggest that the remote access account was inactive prior to being accessed. Instead, Amir describes "the status information of incoming emails."

Furthermore, Amir, paragraph [0046] describes that the "Remote access server component 54 stores repackaged e-mail message 48 in a remote access account 58 dedicated to remote access to the e-mails received at host system 20... until retrieved by the handheld user via a command from handheld appliance 32." Amir, paragraph [0046], describes that "In response to the user's command, repackaged e-mail 48 is downloaded to remote access e-mail client 40 at handheld appliance 32." Accordingly, Amir fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "the processor configured to change the status of any one of the plurality of e-mail accounts in response to a change status request from the communication terminal." as described in new Claim 7. In addition, Salzfass does not describe these limitations. Thus, Amir and Salzfass, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of new Claim 7.

Applicant respectfully submits that Amir and Salzfass, either alone or in combination, also fail to teach or suggest the limitations of "the communication interface is further configured to transmit to the communication terminal, without receipt of a request from the communication terminal for transmission of the received emails, a first e-mail of the received e-mails stored in the electronic mailbox based upon the first e-mail being addressed to a first e-mail account of the email accounts, wherein the status of the first e-mail account is represented as active by the e-mail account flag included in the record that corresponds to the first e-mail account," as described in new Claim 7.

Accordingly, new Claim 7 is patentable over Amir and Salzfass as well as the combination of Amir and Salzfass.

Claim 12

New Claim 12 describes the limitations of "changing the status of at least one of the e-mail accounts in response to a request from the communication terminal," which Amir and Salzfass, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest.

Applicant respectfully submits that Amir and Salzfass, either alone or in combination, also fail to describe the further limitations of "transmitting to the communication terminal, without receipt of a request for transmission of e-mails from the communication terminal, a first e-mail of the received e-mails stored in the electronic mailbox when the first e-mail is addressed to a first e-mail account of the plurality of e-mail accounts, wherein the first e-mail account has the status of which is represented as active by the e-mail account flag included in the record that corresponds to the first e-mail account," as described in new Claim 12.

Accordingly, new Claim 12 is neither anticipated nor obvious in view of Amir and Salzfass or the combined teaching of Amir and Salzfass.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Salzfass and Amir, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest new Claims 7-12. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 7-12 are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney for the Applicant via telephone if such communication would expedite examination or allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 11, 2008



Sanders N. Hillis, Reg. No. 45,712
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
ONE INDIANA SQUARE, SUITE 1600
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46204
(317) 636-0886